

REMARKS

The application has been amended to correct the cited informalities and to place the application, as a whole, into a *prima facie* condition for allowance. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of any new subject matter into the application as a result of the foregoing amendments.

Applicant acknowledges that the present application has been subjected to a restriction requirement, and that claims 7 – 10 now stand withdrawn from consideration, as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claims 1 – 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that: 1) the term "the mount" (claim 1, line 6) lacks antecedent basis; 2) the term (the extension) (claim 1, line 10) lacks antecedent basis; 3) the term "the support unit" (claim 2, line 2; claim 5, line 3) lacks clear antecedent basis because the antecedent term is plural, and the examiner has suggested that the term be made plural in both occurrences; 4) the term "dimensionally stable cross-section" (claim 5, lines 1 – 2) lacks clear antecedent basis, the examiner suggesting that "cross-section" should be changed to – transverse section --.

In response thereto, Applicant has: 1) amended claim 1, to change "the mount" to the stationary mount; 2) deleted "the extension"; 3) amended claims 2 and 5, to make "the support unit" plural at both occurrences; and 4) amended claim 5, to change "dimensionally stable cross-section" to dimensionally stable transverse section.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant submits that the Examiner's bases for rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph should be deemed overcome, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 – 3, 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glynn, U.S. 3,179,969. Claims 1 – 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmid, U.S. 4,356,987. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's substantive bases for rejection of the claims.

Applicant's invention of claim 1 is directed to a mounting structure, which is configured for insertion into a stationary mount (aperture), which mounting structure is configured, so that when tensile loads are applied to it, due to pulling forces exerted on the transverse section (7, 7a or 7b), which result in torque forces, which press the stopping catches against the rims or edge sections of 11 of the mount 3, resulting in a more positive locking. This function is disclosed at page 2, lines 15 – 26 of the application as filed. This torquing function is created by virtue of the fact that the transverse section has a length end to end, which is greater than the distance separating the edges of the stationary mount, and that the transverse section is dimensionally stable (i.e., not significantly compressible in operation). The transverse section acts as a rigid body through which the pulling forces act (see the attached red-marked sketch). As can be seen, because of the rigidity of the transverse section, as well as the fact that it is "wider" than the separation of the edges of the opening of the stationary mount, the force vectors pull the stopping catches against the edges of the

stationary mount, providing for an enhanced engagement between the holding device and the stationary mount.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Glynn (U.S. 3,179,969) nor the Schmid (U.S. 4,356,987) references teaches or suggests such a structure or mode of operation. Neither Glynn nor Schmid discloses a holding device having a transverse section having an effective width that is greater than the distance separating the stationary mount edges, which are acted against by the stopping catches of the holding device.

For example, the Glynn reference shows, in Figs. 1 – 3, that the transverse section appears dimensionally stable over the width of block 17. However there is no disclosure that the stopping catches 18 – 20 are stressed from the inside to the outside (once the anchor is in place – Fig. 3), as soon as a pulling force acts on the transverse section 5, trying to pull section 5 away from mount 12. This can be recognized by understanding that when a pulling force is exerted on section 5 (probably via aperture 8), the force vectors extend directly from aperture 8 down into the legs holding barbs 20. That is, the effective width of the structure forming bore 8 is less than the width of the distance between the edges of the opening, because there is material there for the forces to pass through. Those portions of the mass of the structure forming bore 8 that are to the outside of the edges of the opening are inert, and not involved in the force transmission. Force lines extending from barbs 20, to bore 8, where a pulling force would be directed, would be straight converging lines, thus not providing an additional force pushing barbs 20 outwardly against the edges of the opening.

The Schmid reference discloses a holding clip for releasably attaching electrical conductors. The distance separating the opposite edges of the mounting aperture is substantially greater than the width of the "transverse section" 4. Accordingly, when a pulling force is exerted on section 4 does not create a torquing force tending to pull the notches 6 against the edges of the aperture.

Thus, neither of these references teaches or suggests Applicant's invention of amended claim 1, and claim 1 should be deemed to patentably distinguish over these references. Therefore, Applicant submits that the Examiner's substantive bases for rejection of claim 1 should be deemed overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and allowance there, are respectfully solicited.

Inasmuch as dependent claims 2 – 6 merely serve to further define the subject matter of claim 1, which itself should be deemed allowable, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 – 6, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 2 – 6 are respectfully solicited.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application as a whole, including all of claims 1 – 6.

Should anything further be required, a telephone call to the undersigned at (312) 456-8400 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GREENBERG TRAURIG

Dated: March 19, 2003

Douglas B. Teaney

Douglas B. Teaney
One of Attorneys for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on March 19, 2003.

Douglas B. Teaney

Douglas B. Teaney